

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
3:16-cv-00732-RJC-DSC

JACQUELINE BELL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND)	<u>ORDER</u>
SECURITY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Enforce Mediated Settlement, (Doc. No. 51), and the Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Recommendation ("M&R"), (Doc. No. 58).

I. BACKGROUND

On September 26, 2019, Defendant filed the instant Motion to Enforce Mediated Settlement. (Doc. No. 51.) In the M&R, the Magistrate Judge recommended that this Court grant Defendant's motion. (Doc. No. 58, at 5.) The Magistrate Judge advised the parties of their right to file objections to the M&R within fourteen days, (Doc. No. 58, at 5); however, no objections were filed, and the time for doing so has expired, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2).

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The district court may assign dispositive pretrial matters pending before the court to a magistrate judge for "proposed findings of fact and recommendations." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The Federal Magistrate Act provides that a district court "shall

make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* at § 636(b)(1); Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

III. DISCUSSION

As no objection to the M&R has been made, the parties have waived their right to de novo review of any issues covered in the M&R. After review of the M&R and the entire record, the Court determines that the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is fully consistent with and supported by current law. Therefore, the Court adopts the M&R.

IV. CONCLUSION

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge’s M&R, (Doc. No. 58), is **ADOPTED**, and Defendant’s Motion to Enforce Mediated Settlement, (Doc. No. 51), is **GRANTED**.

Signed: December 30, 2019



Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
United States District Judge
